THE
Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 15, No. 12 (Broadcast 709) March 24, 1969 Dallas, Texas

DAN SMOOT

The Lust For More In Sex Education

An article in the September 9, 1967, issue of *The Wall Street Journal* says, in essence: Sex education is coming to the nation's schools at a rapid clip; PTA groups (national, state, and local) have asked for it; the National Education Association and the American Medical Association have endorsed it; the federal government supports it financially; SIECUS (Sex Information and Educational Council of the U.S.) has been established to promote it; big corporations are spending millions on the planning and production of teaching materials for it.

In January, 1968, the Joint Committee of the National School Boards Association and the American Association of School Administrators issued a statement saying:

"School systems throughout the United States are presently being pressured to offer courses in sex and family life education. . . . Well-intentioned groups . . . are eager to reach the school-age population of over 50,000,000 young people."(1)

The Joint Committee was not criticizing sex education, as such, but was objecting to adding it as a special, or categorical, topic to overburdened public-school curricula. The Joint Committee thinks sex education should be integrated into a comprehensive program of health education in all grades from kindergarten through high school.(1)

In October, 1968, Dr. Mary Calderone estimated that SIECUS had distributed, in one year, 61,000 kits of sex-education materials to educators, PTA groups, medical associations, and others.(2)

In an article in the July-August, 1967, issue of *Children* (periodical published by the U. S. Department of HEW), Dr. Eleanore Braun Luckey (special consultant to HEW's Children's Bureau) says:

"Community agencies, youth organizations, churches, and schools are all scurrying to initiate programs of sex education — sometimes called family life education, boy-girl relationships, or interpersonal development. . . .

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., Box 9538, Dallas, Texas 75214 (office at 6441 Gaston Ave.). Subscriptions: $18.00 for 2 years; $10.00, 1 year; $6.00, 6 months. Dan Smoot was born in Missouri, reared in Texas. With BA and MA degrees from SMU (1938 and 1940), he joined the Harvard faculty (1941) as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent; from 1951 to 1955, a commentator on national radio and television. In 1955, he started his present independent, free-enterprise business: publishing this REPORT and abbreviating it each week for radio and TV broadcasts available for commercial sponsorship by business firms.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1969. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Nevertheless, the goals of sex education are not altogether clear. . . . "

"What's Happening," an article in the November, 1966, issue of *American Education* (periodical published by the U.S. Department of HEW) also noted the nationwide scramble for sex education *now* in the public schools. The article mentioned SIECUS, National Education Association, American Medical Association, and the National PTA as organizations which can help establish or improve sex-education programs, and provide materials for classroom use. The article cites, as the exclusive reason for the intense interest in sex education, the alarming increase in illegitimate babies born to teenage girls and young women, and the spiraling incidence of venereal diseases among teenagers, especially boys.

Doubtless, most *parents* who want sex education in schools naively believe it will help reduce sexual promiscuity among youngsters — or, at least, help them avoid some of the harmful consequences of promiscuity.

Professional sexologists sometimes *promise* that sex education in schools will help reduce premarital pregnancies, abortions, and venereal diseases among teenagers; but they also admit that the promise is false.

In an article published by *Reader's Digest*, June, 1968, SIECUS board member Lester Kirkendall, speaking of sexual activity among youngsters, says:

"And if present trends continue, premarital intercourse will almost certainly increase. The need for sex education, therefore, is that much greater."

This clearly implies the promise that sex education will help reduce the volume of premarital sex activity among young people. Elsewhere in the same article, however, Kirkendall says:

"Most people have the vague hope that it [sex education in schools] will somehow cure half of the world's ills — reduce casual sex experience, cut down on illegitimate births, eliminate venereal disease. To be perfectly blunt about it, we have no way of knowing that sex education will solve any such problems."

One pamphlet which Lester Kirkendall uses in some of his sex-education lectures is entitled "An Experiment in Sexual Communication Between Youth and Adults." He conducted the experiment at the University of Oregon, when he was on the faculty there as a sexologist. He got seven young men to sit as a panel and discuss their actual experiences in sexual intercourse — before an audience composed of men and women, teenage boys and girls.[3]

In lectures to mixed groups, Kirkendall sometimes uses a four-letter obscenity meaning sexual intercourse.[3]

Dr. Mary Calderone (executive director of SIECUS; a grandmother in her middle-sixties; niece of Carl Sandburg; daughter of Edward Steichen, a well-known photographer; graduate of Vassar; a Quaker; a member of the Family Life Committee of the National Council of Churches) also uses four-letter obscenities in lectures to mixed groups, including teenagers. Her excuse is that "euphemisms" in sex discussion are dishonest.[4] She says, for example, that it is wrong to tell five-year-old children that the father "puts" or "places" the seed of a baby in the mother. To illustrate the "correct terminology" to use with five-year-olds, she describes the sex act, in detail, using explicit terms, naming the sexual organs involved, explaining their role and use in coitus.[4, 5]

Calderone and her fellow sexologists in SIECUS say children should be taught that self-gratification is a normal, expected, almost-universally practiced, and often helpful manifestation of sex.[5]

SIECUS advocates "responsible sexuality" (or "situation ethics") as a guide to sexual conduct — which means that any kind of sexual activity is good if participants feel good about it. Conversely, SIECUS holds, religious taboos and society's conventional moral codes about sexual behavior are harmful because they create repressions and feelings of shame about sex.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SIECUS sexologists must know (if gullible parents, PTA leaders, and school officials supporting school sex programs do not know) that the SIECUS kind of vulgar, permissive, amoral sex education, far from curing any of "the world's ills," can only have a debasing effect on young people. There is statistical proof of this, not only in Sweden where the SIECUS kind of sex education has been compulsory in all grades of all schools for ten years[6], but also in the United States where such official debauchery of school children is relatively new.

The November, 1968, issue of *Today's Health* published statistics revealing that incidence of venereal disease in recent years has risen 78% in the United States, 123% in California. California has had more of the SIECUS kind of sex education than any other state.

The SIECUS sex-education program was begun in Anaheim, California (Orange County), public schools in 1965. In 1966, 300 Orange County girls had to drop out of high school because of pregnancy — 30 of them from junior high schools. In 1967, the Orange County Public Adoption Agency was receiving three or four unwed mothers a day — the youngest unwed mother reported being age 13. At a home for unwed mothers in nearby Los Angeles, one out of every five was from Orange County.[7]

A line from a news article in the March 2, 1967, issue of the *Anaheim-Fullerton Independent* sums it up:

"The new sexual morality is leaving a broad trail of heartbreak in Orange County."

Jo Hindman, in a column on "School House Pornography" in the February 27, 1969, issue of *The Eagle*, sketches a picture that is beginning to emerge throughout the United States:

"An increasing flood of revoltingly crude and pornographic material, mislabeled as 'education' by some school hierarchies, continues to trigger childhood tragedies: unwed pregnancies, illegitimate births, incestuous brother-sister attacks, abortions and venereal diseases — welling from the bog created by the too young knowing too much too soon."

Leading parents to expect benefits, which SIECUS officials know sex education in schools will not produce, is only one SIECUS stratagem. There are others.

SIECUS board member Lester Kirkendall denounces opponents of sex education in schools as a "fringe group of dissidents who do not think rationally"; who "have hangups about sex" because they think sexual behavior should be guided by moral codes and religious prohibitions, not understanding that "morals are relative" and that the only valid "moral" restriction on sexual activities is concern for "exercising responsibility toward another person." He says parents become traumatic about their youngsters engaging in sexual activity, because they do not realize that premarital sexual intercourse, even for children, is all right, provided "consideration is given for the partner."[8]

Kirkendall says sexologists can, however, slip sex education into school curricula without unduly alarming parents, if they will start with the premise that all children receive some sex training by simply living. "Any school," he claims, "is fully warranted in saying that it is 'expanding and improving' rather than 'starting' a sex-education program. The public is less afraid of expanding than of innovating. . . ." He suggests weaving sex education into regular school courses, in preference to establishing it as a separate course, because, he says, "the more sex education can be set within the normal program the less it will be singled out as unusual and threatening."[9]

To school officials who want separate sex-education courses, Kirkendall says: "Don't say that you are going to start a sex-education course. Just sneak it in as an experimental course and see how people react." Once school officials sneak sex education in "experimentally," they should never retreat, Kirkendall says. He advises: "Always move

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forward. Say that you are going to enrich, expand, and make it better. The opposition can't stop something that you have already started."[8]

And, he urges: "Go to your PTA and get support. That's where the power lies."[8]

An insatiable lust for more seems to be a trait of many sexologists. No matter how bad a sex-education program may be, there are always some sexologists agitating to make it worse.

In England, where sex education in the schools is already of the "frank" variety recommended by SIECUS in the United States, a producer of sex-education movies plans to make, for classroom use, the kind of film that, in the United States, is generally shown only at stag parties and is still outlawed in most states and barred from interstate commerce by federal law: a film showing a nude couple engaged in coitus. Frank Sandy, chief of Brodie Educational Film Strips, Ltd., which supplies educational materials to 10,000 schools, says:

"We are looking for a young, married, church-going couple of fine moral character for our film. The film is intended for an audience of 15- and 16-year-olds.

"We feel that a film like this is the best way to give sex instruction to children."[10]

Several London school authorities are "reserving judgment" on the proposed film. They do not yet know whether to use it in schools.[10]

In Sweden, sex education in schools seems to have gone the limit; but that is not far enough for some sexologists. In April, 1967, Tore Robertson, 24-year-old public school teacher in Stockholm, said every good high school needs a sex room, where teenage lovers can seek respite from the daily school grind. A powerful student organization branded the suggestion "idiotic." Robertson said this was merely a temporary setback, because "future schools will have such rooms."[11]

What's happening in England and Sweden is a harbinger of things to come for the U.S.

NEXT WEEK: "Contributing To The Delinquency Of Minors," the fourth in a series of five issues on sex education in schools.

BOUND VOLUMES

We are now out of 1962 bound volumes, but still have 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966 volumes, which you may purchase — as long as they last — at the special price of $3.00 each (regular price $10.00).

SUBSCRIBE TO THE DAN SMOOT REPORT:
6 mos. — $6.00; 1 yr. — $10.00; 2 yrs. — $18.00

Please notify us of any change of address *before* you move. With increased postal rates, we no longer can afford to remail issues returned by the Post Office.

FOOTNOTES

(1) Leaflet published by the Joint Committee of the National School Boards Association, available free from the U.S. Office of Education

(2) *The Daily Oklahoman*, Nov. 12, 1968

(3) *Anaheim Bulletin*, Dec. 20, 1968

(4) *Saturday Evening Post*, June 29, 1968

(5) "Goodbye to the Birds and the Bees," by Dr. Mary S. Calderone, *American Education*, Nov., 1966; *Masturbation*, by Warren R. Johnson, SIECUS Study Guide No. 3

(6) "Debauching Our Children," *The Dan Smoot Report*, Mar. 10, 1969, pp. 37-40 (available at prices listed below)

(7) *Anaheim-Fullerton Independent*, Mar. 2, 1967; "School House Pornography; Road to Pre-Marital Sex," by Jo Hindman, *The* (Yakima, Wash.) *Eagle*, Feb. 27, 1969

(8) "School Sexology Plans Charted at Hush-Hush Session," by John Steinbacher, staff writer, *Anaheim Bulletin*, Dec. 18, 1968

(9) "Some Practical Suggestions For The School Starting A Sex Education Program," by Lester A. Kirkendall and Helen M. Cox, *Children*, July-Aug., 1967

(10) *Parade*, Oct. 6, 1968

(11) *Tulsa Daily World*, Apr. 5, 1967

REPRINTS OF THIS ISSUE
(for bulk mailing to one address):

1 copy	$ .25	100 copies	$ 6.50
10 copies	1.00	200 copies	12.00
25 copies	2.00	500 copies	28.00
50 copies	3.50	1000 copies	50.00

Texans Add 4% for Sales Tax
(Add 50¢ for special-handling postage)
THE DAN SMOOT REPORT TAylor 1-2303
BOX 9538 DALLAS, TEXAS 75214

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED